

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. TN-09667D 1995 10/734,757 12/11/2003 James Parks EXAMINER 05/20/2005 7590 Black & Decker Inc. PETERSON, KENNETH E 701 E. Joppa Road, TW-199 PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT Towson, MD 21286 3724

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				ונ
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/734,757	PARKS ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
٠		Kenneth E Peterson	3724	
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communicator Reply	ntion appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addre	ISS
THE - Extra after - If th - If N - Fail Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical eperiod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) do period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuture to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reication. lays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty orry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON in the statute, cause the application to become AB.	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this comm ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.
Status				
1) 🏻	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 25 March 2005		
2a)□	-)⊠ This action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for	•	ers, prosecution as to the m	erits is
,—	closed in accordance with the practice	•		,
Disposi	tion of Claims			
4)⊠	Claim(s) 26,28 and 47-52 is/are pendir	ng in the application.	•	
ŕ	4a) Of the above claim(s) 47-52 is/are v			
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) 26,28 is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election requirement.		
Applicat	tion Papers	,		
9)[The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.		
10)	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.			
·	Applicant may not request that any objection			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	e correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to b	•	•	• •
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do	cuments have been received.	.,,,,,,	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of	the priority documents have been	received in this National Sta	age
	application from the International	l Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
*	See the attached detailed Office action f	or a list of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachmei	• •	_	:	
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO	•	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date	
· —	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT	O/SB/08) 5) Notice of In	formal Patent Application (PTO-15	2)
	er No(s)/Mail Date	´ 6) ☐ Other:		

1. Claims 26 and 28 are objected to for incongruous titling.

As per MPEP 2173.02, a claim is given weight for all of the recitations in the body of the claim (See *In re Larsen*). This means that Applicant's claimed invention includes a rail and a workpiece supporting surface, which means that the invention is more than just a "fence assembly" as the title would suggest.

There are two possible ways to correct this;

- A) remove the recitations of all non-fence assembly parts from the body of the claim.
 - B) change the claim title and transitional phrase to refer to a table saw.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiotani et al.'802 in view of Schnitzer '700.

Shiotani et al.'802, who shows a fence with all of the recited limitations including a handle (404), a rod (405), a first cam (left side of 406) at a first end of the rod, a second cam (right side of 406) at the second end of the rod, and first movable plate (left side of 409) and a second movable plate (right side of 409).

Shiotani's cams and plates are not separate from one another, and the cam does not directly contact the plate. However, this is a well known variation as shown by

Art Unit: 3724

Schnitzer, who has separate cams (33,33) that directly contact separate plates (31,31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Shiotani by making the cams and plates be separate and directly contact one another, as taught by Schnitzer, since this is an art-recognized equivalent known for the same purpose. See MPEP 2144.06.

In regards to claim 28, Shiotani's rod (405) is circular rather than square. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known to make such a rod to have square portions, in order to insure co-rotation with joining parts. Since Applicant has not challenged this, it is known admitted prior art as per MPEP 2144.03(C). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Shiotani by making his rod have a square cross section, as is well known, in order to insure co-rotation with joining parts.

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Application/Control Number: 10/734,757 Page 4

Art Unit: 3724

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ken Peterson at 571-272-4512, on Monday-Thursday, 7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap, can be reached at 571-272-4514. In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that papers be faxed to 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov or call the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

kp May 2, 2005

KENNETH E. PETERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER